

- than we have been officially told. Can we imagine that in fact he arrived a few days later than October 16, in time for his Embassy performance on October 31? The evidence for the October 16 arrival date is thin, and some of it questionable. "Oswald's Historic Diary" begins unambiguously "Oct. 16. Arrive from Helsinki by train" (16 WH 102). But the so-called "Historic Diary" is actually a document Oswald wrote much later, and it is demonstrably wrong with respect to many facts and dates. Harder to refute is Oswald's passport, unambiguously stamped with the date of October 15 for his exit from Finland and entry into the Soviet Union (18 WH 163).
133. Peter Dale Scott, "From Dallas to Watergate," in Peter Dale Scott, Paul L. Hoch, and Russell Stetler, *The Assassinations*, 366.
 134. Riebling, *Wedge*, 162; cf. Burton Hersh, *The Old Boys*, 427. The first known CIA documents discussing the assassination of Castro date from December 1959 (Church Committee Assassination Report, 92-93).
 135. Hersh, *The Old Boys*, 243, 427-28.
 136. *Washington Post*, November 1, 1959 (reprinted in Skolnick, 2; cf. Newman, 18): "[Oswald's] sister-in-law said, 'He said he wanted to travel a lot and talked about going to Cuba.'" The first Fain Report of May 1960 attributed the same general thought to Marguerite: "She stated he had mentioned something about his desire to travel and said something about the fact that he might go to Cuba" (17 WH 703; cf. 17 WH 727). Cuba was the first country mentioned on Oswald's passport application (22 WH 78). The remark attributed by UPI to Robert Oswald's wife Vada Oswald was probably written down by the *Fort Worth Star Telegram* reporter who visited the Robert Oswalds on October 31, 1959.
 137. Chief, JMWAVE (Theodore Shackley) to Chief, Special Affairs Staff (Desmond FitzGerald); Dispatch #UFGA-13059 of 13 Dec 63 with attachment; FOIA #411-168; NARA #104-10018-10074; PS #78-82-85.
 138. Howard Hunt Fitness Report, 1963-64.

Gross Misunderstandings

by

Kathleen A. Cunningham

The House Select Committee on Assassinations [HSCA] radically misinterpreted a remark by Dr. Humes. Their conclusions state:

"... [Humes] told the committee that after writing the report he destroyed the original notes because they were stained with the blood of the President and he felt it would be 'inappropriate to retain [them] to turn in to anyone in that condition.'" [1] [Emphasis added]

But, they had misunderstood. Humes had told them just what he told the Warren Commission—a draft of the report was burned. Had they not missed Humes' meaning, it is probable the autopsy notes which aren't in the record would have been sought and, if found, entered into evidence. The value of these "missing" records is vast. They would either affirm the pathologists' findings, supporting a single gunman, or show that those findings are rightfully being questioned by critics.

Using a series of questions, this article will illustrate the HSCA's error. It will demonstrate that the notes existed at least two days after the HSCA thought they were destroyed, and that a portion of the notes, for reasons unknown, were never entered into evidence.

What Did Humes Tell the Warren Commission He Destroyed?

"In the privacy of my own home, early in the morning of Sunday, November 24th, I made a draft of this report which I later revised, and of which this represents the revision. That draft I personally burned in the fireplace of my recreation room." [2] [Emphasis added]

Any possibility that Humes misstated himself, meaning to say that notes were burned, is negated by the fact that he was discussing materials handed him by counsel, and introduced into evidence. [3] These materials, known as CE 397, include Humes' notes on his telephone conversation with Dr. Perry, a copy of the holographic report, a "certificate" attesting to the passing of "autopsy notes and the holographic draft" to higher authority, and Dr. Boswell's face sheet. Therefore, logic dictates Humes burned an

Kathleen A. Cunningham
500 SE 49th Ave.
Ocala, FL 34471

early version of one of these four documents — most reasonably the one now represented by the holograph. To presume he'd been mistakenly handed the autopsy notes and improperly referred to them as a "draft of this report," would mean he was saying he'd revised their contents. Because of the special status of autopsy notes as evidence, [4] no responsible physician would say this, and no responsible attorney would allow such a statement to go unchallenged. Further, if Humes had been given the autopsy notes, then we would find them in the record as they were assigned an exhibit number. But, only Dr. Boswell's facesheet is in evidence.

What Did He tell the HSCA's Forensic Pathology Sub-Panel?

Humes initiated the topic, offering: ". . .

I destroyed, some notes related to this, by burning in the fireplace of my home, and that is true. However, nothing that was destroyed is not present in this write-up." [5]

Without interruption he plunged into a patriotically stirring tale about the stained chair in which Lincoln sat when murdered, then concluded;

"And here I was, now in the possession of a number of pieces of paper, some of which unavoidably . . . were stained in part with the blood of our deceased President. . . . for that reason only . . . having transcribed those notes onto the pieces of paper that are before you, I destroyed those pieces of paper. . . . I felt they would fall into the hands of some sensation seeker." Dr. BADEN. "Is everything you had on the notes recorded in the holographic document before you, which is kept in the Archives, that you wrote at that time?" Dr. HUMES. "Correct. Now, there are corrections and comments and changes of language in here. I think I'd have to go through them and with care to see if some of them are substantive or not substantive . . . some minor changes were made . . . some of them sounded like we'd expressed an opinion, and we thought maybe that wasn't what should be done." [6] [Emphasis added]

This clearly supports his Warren Commission testimony. Were Humes speaking of autopsy notes, he would not be concerned about blood stains—as evidenced by the presence of Boswell's face sheet in the record. Neither would he be troubled by "corrections and comments and changes of language." He would be unconcerned about the implication of expressing an opinion—something which isn't

done in the body of the protocol. [7] Most especially, he would never suggest that any changes may have been substantive. These are dilemmas only encountered in the drafting of a report.

Moreover, his explanation that the destruction took place after "having transcribed" the material onto "the pieces of paper that are before you," indicates Humes was, without question, discussing the destruction of a protocol draft. There can be no doubt at all, because "before" them was a copy of the typed protocol. [8]

Had these panelists been familiar with the case and Humes' prior testimony, this misunderstanding may not have occurred. However, the panel was purposefully made up "of doctors [who] had not reviewed the autopsy materials previously," [9] and who, apparently, were not to have a working knowledge of the case. [10] Because of this failing, the autopsy notes are only partially represented in the record. Other such losses of information and documentation seem to have occurred for the same reason [11] (a further discussion of this is outside the scope of this paper).

Therefore, of any of the mistakes the HSCA may have made, its failure to use experts who were familiar with the prior testimony was probably its largest. It is hoped that any future investigations will heed this valuable lesson, and utilize experts with a solid knowledge of the case and all previous testimony and documentation.

Have Other Pathologists Confirmed the Existence of the Autopsy Notes?

Dr. Finck is not on the record on this point, but Dr. Boswell is. In November of 1966, he confirmed their existence to The Baltimore Sun:

. . . Dr. Humes destroyed "certain preliminary draft notes" by burning them in his fireplace.

Dr. Boswell said that all original notes were preserved, as far as he knows, and were turned over to the National Archives. He said the things that were burned were copies of the protocol as they were revised. [12] [Emphasis added]

Is There Testimony Telling Us About the First Draft That Humes and Boswell Assert Was Destroyed?

Humes explained to the HSCA's Forensic Pathology Sub-Panel [FPSP] that he did not leave the morgue following the postmortem until he went home Saturday (at about 5:30 or 6:00 AM) to fulfill a religious obligation. He returned to the hospital some five to six hours later, at an unremembered time between 10:30 and noon, to meet with Drs. Finck and Boswell. After phoning Dr. Perry in Dallas, they reviewed the pertinent details of the autopsy.

During this review Humes recorded their thoughts on "other notes." Having learned that the completed report was expected on the 24th, Humes then returned home for the second time that day. Upon arriving at this residence, he slept for a few hours and began writing from these "other notes" with the details Finck and Boswell had added [13] (neither Humes nor anyone else have ever stated the actual notes were taken from the Naval hospital).

Humes' reference to "other notes" downplays their real significance. In his testimony before the full committee, he called this same document "draft notes." [14] Dr. Boswell also affirmed their substance, telling HSCA staff investigators they were a "... reasonably good report of the gross findings," [15] and Captain Stover, Humes' superior officer, supports this in referring to them as a "first rough draft." [16]

When Did Humes Write the "Other Notes" He and Boswell Claim Were Burned, And How Could They Be Stained With the President's Blood?

According to Humes' formal HSCA testimony, he wrote the first draft immediately following the autopsy's completion (11 PM [17] to midnight [18]), but prior to leaving the morgue to go home at 5:30 to 6:00: "I had the draft notes [at home] which we had prepared in the autopsy room, which I copied." [19]

This meshes with the other testimony he gave, in which he explained that, by the time he left the morgue the first time, he'd had no sleep in 48 hours. [20] He reportedly slept while at home, but "Not too much." [21] Because of this, he likely used any extra time he had before going to the religious function to shower and shave. Thus, unless the drafting took place in the morgue, Humes could not have arrived at the meeting with Finck and Boswell with any documentation.

Moreover, between the end of autopsy and the body's departure at 3:50 AM, [22] the body was being embalmed, reconstructed, made up and dressed. So if writing occurred during this time period, some its pages could have easily been "unavoidably" spotted with blood.

One further observation can be made from this testimony. By the time Humes returned home following the Saturday morning meeting, he would have had roughly seven hours to work on this first draft, with not only the autopsy notes, but also the added comments of both the other pathologists. This may intimate he took home only the draft, as he probably would have had no further need for the original notes. Of course, if he never took the notes home, he could not have burned them in his fireplace.

Is the Burning of an Initial Draft Backed by Documentation?

Two "certificates" Humes signed on November 24, 1963 establish the destruction of an early draft. The first reads: "I, James J. Humes, certify that I have destroyed by burning certain preliminary draft notes relating to Naval Medical School Autopsy Report A63-272 and have officially transmitted all other papers related to this report to higher authority." [Emphasis added]

Though "preliminary draft notes" could refer to notes made in the course of autopsy, the second certificate indicates it meant otherwise. It states:

"I, James J. Humes, certify that all working papers associated with Naval Medical School Autopsy Report A63-272 have remained in my personal custody at all times. Autopsy notes and the holographic draft of the final report were handed to Commanding Officer, U.S. Naval Medical School, at 1700, 24 November 1963. No papers relating to this case remain in my possession." [23] [Emphasis added]

The bottom of this document bears an addendum which underscores its intent to establish a chain of possession, a vital step in protecting the veracity of evidence. That note reads, "Received above working papers this date," followed by the signature of Captain Stover. Because of the status of original autopsy notes as evidence, this kind of documentation would be expected. Drafts of the report are not evidence, and documenting their possession would be necessary only in unusual circumstances.

Thus it appears that these certificates are discussing three sets of papers:

- 1.) "draft notes" ("other notes") which were written in the morgue, taken to Humes' home and burned;
- 2.) "working papers" which were drafted in Humes' home from the "other notes"; and
- 3.) "autopsy notes and the holographic draft" which may have never left the hospital and were passed to Stover after the final protocol was completed.

Accordingly, this would indicate the first certificate is not referring to a specific document remaining in Humes' custody, but specific information. In other words, nothing was lost, stolen, or shared with unauthorized persons.

How Many Times Was the Protocol Revised?

It can be postulated there may have been as many as four revisions of the protocol including the final typed report. The first was written very early Saturday morning before Humes ever left the hospital. Later that morning, handwritten notations from the meeting with the other two patholo-

gists were added to it, and then on Saturday night/early Sunday morning this was merged into a second draft. On the 24th the draft written over night was jointly revised for the third time by all three prosecutors, and is probably represented by the holographic version now in evidence. Finally, when the protocol was typed there were a few more changes over the holographic copy.

Although the holograph and typed protocol are in evidence, the other two drafts are not. This should not be considered suspicious, however—early drafts, reworded, reconstructed, with overlooked points added are to be expected. These are not evidence and there is no reason to retain them. What is significant about the two missing drafts is that one is documented while the other is known only through testimony. It is the first draft's documentation that is meaningful. It points to that draft and tells us it no longer exists. It explains its existence ended by burning. It implies that none save the signer witnessed the destruction. It tells us nothing else was destroyed.

Why is the Destruction of The First Draft Documented?

That we possess records on the burning of this draft implies the draft or the destruction was somehow uncommon. As might be expected if the destruction took place in Humes' home, it probably occurred without witnesses present. This factor may have been complicated by its removal from the Naval facility against a receipt. Documentation would then be demanded to both balance the record and protect the Navy against Humes having shown it to unauthorized persons or personally retaining it. Yet even if it was not removed against a receipt, the Navy would have still wanted its unwitnessed destruction documented, and the protection of the information it contained guaranteed by Dr. Humes.

The implications of the inadvertent leak of this data could have been catastrophic. It may have placed the homicide investigation into serious jeopardy, resulting in the aborted prosecution of the suspect in custody, and/or any future suspects that might be discovered. This would have greatly embarrassed the Navy, and caused the Kennedy family needless additional grief. Moreover, if Humes had retained the draft, any differences between it and the final protocol would have resulted in great suspicion if it ever became public. Therefore, whether released against a receipt or not, a record reflecting the destruction of the draft and its control by Humes would be expected.

Is There Documentation Supporting the Removal of Either Autopsy Notes or a Protocol Draft from the Navy's Control?

In the event that the notes were taken from the hospital, we would expect to find this documented to preserve the chain of custody. No such record is known to exist, nor can it be inferred from other documents or testimony known to the author. Likewise, the author is unaware of any documentation regarding the removal of a draft from the hospital. Testimony which has been discussed hints that only a draft was removed. However, records do exist which may infer the existence of a document recording its removal.

"The first rough draft of this report was sighted in part by CAPT. R. O. CANADA, MC, USN on 23 November." [24]

This quote is from a memorandum signed by Captain Stover. It seems plausible to conjecture that he dictated this memo, for it seems odd that he would mention Canada saw ("sighted") a rough draft. But, he surely may have mentioned that Canada "cited" it. To "cite" means to refer, mention, report on, quote, acknowledge or document. If Canada "cited" this draft on the 23rd, it is logical to presume that he had a reason for making such a reference. Canada's ranking role at the Naval facility would make him vested in protecting the hospital and the Navy. Therefore it can be speculated that he would demand documentation for any autopsy materials which were removed from the facility by his staff. We know Humes took something home with him. His testimony, supported by the certificates and The Baltimore Sun's attribution to Dr. Boswell, indicates it was this first draft. Thus it seems possible that Canada's "sighting" reflects the issuance of a receipt or memorandum logging the drafts' removal from the hospital.

Do the Autopsy Notes Have a Chain of Custody?

Custody of the notes is documented between November 24th and 26th. Captain Stover took possession of the written materials from Humes via the second certificate and passed them on the same day. The receipt Stover penned acknowledges the transfer of "Autopsy notes and holographic original of subject report . . ." to Admiral Galloway. [25] On November 25th, Admiral Galloway wrote a memo transferring the documentation to Admiral Burkley. It reads:

"Transmitted herewith by hand is the sole remaining copy (number eight) of the completed protocol in the case of John F. Kennedy. Attached are the work papers used by the Prosecutor and his assistant." [26]

The day following this receipt, the Secret Service issued one of its own to Admiral Burkley for the "Autopsy report and the notes of the examining doctor." [27]

Possession of the notes, in brief, was:

—November 24th, Humes to Stover to Galloway

—November 25th, Galloway to Burkley

—November 26th, Burkley to the Secret Service

To the author's knowledge, there is no documentation for the notes after the 26th. There is, however, a reference by Lee Rankin to autopsy "minutes" at a Warren Commission meeting in early 1964:

"...we don't have the minutes of the autopsy, and we asked for those because we wanted to see what doctor a [sic] said about something while he was saying it, to see whether it is supported by the conclusions in the autopsy and so forth..." [28]

That Rankin "asked for" the minutes suggests he felt they could be obtained. That he then passed this information to the Commissioners implies he thought—conceivably erroneously—their existence had been confirmed to him. But do "minutes" equate with notes?

The reader should take careful note of the language used in this quote and those of Jenkins and McHugh which will be cited shortly. All three hint at an audio recording rather than handwritten notes.

Audio recordings of a pathologists' observations during autopsy are commonplace by today's standards and were discussed by the HSCA's medical panel in their recommendations. [29] Because no witnesses were asked if the autopsy was recorded, the author wrote two Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests to the National Naval Medical Center/Naval Medical School to learn if they even had a recording system in 1963. Neither request received a response. [30] If such a system was in place, it would be surprising indeed to learn that it was not used.

The author also requested a search for recordings of the postmortem from the National Archives. None could be found. [31] A like search for documentation to support Rankin's request for either recordings or handwritten notes was also fruitless. [32] However, the scope of the request may have been too narrow. Therefore, the author submitted a third request covering other contingencies. At the time of this writing it is too soon to expect a response. [33]

Is Everything in the Autopsy Notes Represented in the Final Protocol?

It has been presumed, because of the HSCA's error, that Humes testified that everything in the autopsy notes was represented in the protocol. We now know that is not what he said. Humes told the FPSP that everything mentioned in the first draft of the report was in the protocol. However, the question of missing data from the autopsy notes must still be addressed.

Though a full discussion of this issue would far exceed the

word limitations allowed by The Fourth Decade we can state—based exclusively on just one side of Dr. Boswell's face sheet—that it is not. The weights for the kidneys, liver, heart and spleen listed on its front appear nowhere in either the autopsy report or supplemental protocol. With the knowledge that some information is missing from the final protocol, questioning the absence of other facts is demanded.

Who Took Notes and What Kind Were They?

DR. FINCK: "... these drawings [on the face sheet] may have been made by both Dr. Humes and Dr. Boswell." [34] "... I saw Dr. Boswell taking notes. I saw both Dr. Humes and Dr. Boswell taking notes at the time of autopsy..."

"... both of them [Humes and Boswell] made notes during the autopsy." [35]

"During the autopsy I took measurements, but all my notes were turned over to Dr. Humes, and after the autopsy I also wrote notes but the notes I wrote at the time of autopsy had a diagram . . ." [36]

Baden: "Do you recall how many pieces of paper actually you turned over to Dr. Humes?"

"Finck: "No, I don't remember that."

"Baden: "Was it more than one?"

"Finck: "... I don't remember the number of pages, honestly." [37]

Baden: "Is this [Boswell's face sheet] what you were referring to as one of the pages of notes you were writing on?"

"Finck: "I don't know." [38]

DR. BOSWELL: "... [I] took notes during the autopsy..." [39] "The weights [on the face sheet] of the organ [sic] are not written by me. Everything else on here is mine, and this diagram on the back is mine..." [40]

DR. HUMES: "'J' [Boswell] and I both took down autopsy notes and diagrams." [41]

CAPTAIN STOVER: "... the doctors were taking notes." [42]

JIM JENKINS: "Jenkins recalls writing down the weights [on the face sheet]..." [43]

"... possible that Dr. Humes added to the sheet." [44]

"... possibly Humes made recorded notations..." [45]

DR. KARNEI: "... Dr. Boswell was actually taking notes... they [undefined] were both working on the diagrams." [46]

GEN. McHUGH: ". . . the pathologists recorded minute notes . . ." [47]

What Conclusions Can Be Drawn From These Statements?

We can unequivocally conclude only four points:

- 1.) Humes, Boswell and Finck made notes and contributed to "diagrams;"
- 2.) One face sheet was primarily used by Boswell, and at least one piece of paper was primarily used by Finck;
- 3.) Finck made notes after the autopsy; and
- 4.) Boswell's face sheet had a hand drawn sketch on its back which he made.

The reason no more can be positively inferred is twofold.

First, the "diagrams" that both Humes and Finck attest to making cannot be positively construed to mean "face sheets." "Diagrams" may refer to freehand sketches. Secondly, while there is testimony that hints that Dr. Humes made notes on Boswell's face sheet, [48] there is none which firmly establishes Humes had his own. So, it has to be considered possible that Humes' "diagram" was merely an added notation on Boswell's sheet. Similarly, we have no information to use to determine what Finck meant by "diagram," or if either Boswell or Humes used any additional pieces of paper. Still, the notes Finck turned in are clearly missing.

The reader should note that, although Finck turned over a large amount of documentation to the HSCA, [49] he gave them nothing of substance dated prior to his highly detailed 1965 memorandum to Gen. Blumberg (HSCA Agency File 006165). This suggests that his post-autopsy notes—which there is no reason to believe he does not still possess—may have been the source material for the memo.

Has There Ever Been a Search For the Autopsy Notes?

In addition to Mr. Rankin's 1964 request for "minutes," others have looked for these materials. The Department of Justice appears to have made two attempts, both in November of 1966. [50] In 1978, the HSCA caused the Kennedy Library [51] and the Navy's Bureau of Medicine and Surgery [52] to search their files for anything related to the autopsy. Neither of these searches turned up the notes. Further, in the National Archives and Records Administration box in the JFK section of Archives II, is an undated and unsigned multi-page list of documents requested by researchers which the Archives is unable to find. The first entry on page seven of that document is any autopsy notes in addition to "CE 391."

The author has personally requested these documents under FOIA from the National Archives, the Secret Service,

and the Kennedy, Johnson and Ford Libraries. [53] All replied they did not have the records.

What Can We Conclude?

Humes has been consistent in reporting that an early draft of the protocol was brought to his home and destroyed. His testimony is supported by Boswell's assertion in The Baltimore Sun in 1966 and backed by documentation. The custody of the autopsy notes is well recorded from the day the HSCA mistakenly assumed they were destroyed until two days afterward. Their last known custodian was the Secret Service. There is absolutely no evidence to support the destruction of these records. The FPSP simply misunderstood.

No one has ever stated, nor are there any records which imply, the actual autopsy notes left the Naval facility. Sadly, for history, the FPSP's purposeful lack of familiarity with the record is likely the reason this occurred.

The protocol in the public domain does not represent all the information that was in the notes. Neither are all the notes taken represented in the official record. Dr. Finck turned in notes which had a "diagram," and it is reasonable to suspect that Drs. Boswell and Humes may have also made notes which are absent from the record.

It is not possible, however, to determine when the missing notes were removed from the record. Neither is it possible to ascertain who removed them, or if their absence from the record implies something sinister. Such thinking would be sheer speculation and irresponsible. Moreover, as will be explored in another article, there is evidence for the existence of additional written materials related to the autopsy which are not part of the record.

Nonetheless, the autopsy notes may still exist—perhaps misfiled somewhere in the bowels of the National Archives or are likewise lost in the files of another agency. However, until they are discovered, the notes that Finck reconstructed after the autopsy, and which are still quite likely in his possession, must be considered the most vitally important and historically significant medical documents written in our country's history.

Notes

1. House Select Committee on Assassinations, Volume 7, page 16. References to this source cited hereafter in format: 7HSCA16.
2. Warren Commission Hearings & Exhibits, Volume 2, page 373. References to this source cited hereafter in format: 2H373.
3. 2H272.
4. 7HSCA192-193.

5. 7HSCA257.
6. 7HSCA258.
7. DiMaio, Dominick J. and Vincent, J.M., Forensic Pathology Boca Raton: CRC Press, 1993, page 493.
8. 7HSCA256,258.
9. 7HSCA243.
10. 7HSCA248.
11. For an example, see HSCA Agency File 014258, letter dated 1/5/78 from NASA's Thomas Canning to Robert Blakey.
12. The Baltimore Sun, November 25, 1966, page 1, "Pathologist Who Made Examination Defends Commission's Version; Says Pictures And Details Back Up Warren Report." Richard H. Levine. Cited hereafter as The Baltimore Sun.
13. 7HSCA16, 256-257.
14. 1HSCA330.
15. HSCA Agency File 002071, page 8, Boswell; also see The Baltimore Sun.
16. Transmittal memorandum dated 24 November 1963 from Capt. J.H. Stover, Jr., MC, USN to Commanding Officer, National Naval Medical Center. Typed on U.S. Naval Medical Center letterhead. Cited hereafter as Transmittal Memorandum.
17. 2H349.
18. HSCA Agency File 013617, page 3 of Finck, page 71 of document.
19. 1HSCA330.
20. 7HSCA257.
21. 1HSCA330.
22. Report titled "After Action Report," page 2, from the MDW files held at the Ford Library. The report is unsigned, but it is believed the writer was the MDW's Robert O'Malley.
23. 17H48.
24. Transmittal memorandum.
25. Transmittal memorandum.
26. Receipt from Admiral Calvin B. Galloway to Admiral G. Burkley, dated November 25, 1963. Typed on National Naval Medical Center letterhead.
27. Secret Service File CO-2-34030.
28. Transcript of meeting of the Warren Commission, January 21, 1964, page 35.
29. 7HSCA187,188.
30. The most recent of these requests was written August 25, 1995. The office of Congressman Cliff Stearns of Florida is currently attempting to get a response from the Navy.
31. Letter dated April 11, 1995 from William G. Lewis, Motion Picture, Sound and Video Branch, National Archives at College Park.
32. Letter dated June 21, 1995 from Steven D. Tilley, JFK Liaison, National Archives at College Park.
33. Request submitted to the National Archives at College Park on December 14, 1995.
34. HSCA Agency File 002035, page 67, Finck's New Orleans testimony 2/24/69, part I.
35. HSCA Agency File 002036, page 96, Finck's New Orleans testimony 2/24/69, part II.
36. HSCA Agency File 013617, pages 82-83, Finck.
37. Audio tape 233JFK.105095, Finck's testimony to the FPSP 3/11/78, tape 1, side 1; note wording differs slightly from transcript (HSCA Agency File 013617, page 83).
38. HSCA Agency File 013617, pages 97-98, Finck.
39. HSCA Agency File 002071, page 9, Boswell.
40. 7HSCA253.
41. The Journal of the American Medical Association, May 27, 1992, page 2798.
42. HSCA Agency File 013615, page 1, Stover; HSCA Agency File 002193, page 10, Jenkins.
43. HSCA Agency File 013615, page 5, Jenkins.
44. HSCA Agency File 002193, page 6, Jenkins.
45. HSCA Agency File 002193, page 10, Jenkins.
46. HSCA Agency File 002198, page 4, Karnei.
47. HSCA Agency File 009414, page 4, McHugh.
48. HSCA Agency File 002193, page 6, Jenkins, and HSCA Agency File 002035, page 67, Finck's New Orleans testimony 2/24/69, part I; also 7HSCA253.
49. HSCA Agency File 006139.
50. DOJCIVIL 182-10001-10021 dated November 22, 1966, titled "Discussions with Naval Medical Staff Participating in JFK Autopsy," from Carl W. Belcher to file and DOJCIVIL 182-10001-10020 dated November 8, 1966, memorandum from W. David Slawson to the Office of the Attorney General, page 2.
51. NARA 179-30003-10277, letter from William Moss to Trudy Peterson dated 7/18/78.
52. BMS 174-10002-10092, memo dated 26 May 1978 from Rear Admiral J.T. Horgan to Robert Blakey.
53. Secret Service, 12/17/95; Johnson Library, 11/8/95; Kennedy Library, 11/8/95; National Archives, 1/4/94, 3/14/94, 3/5/95 and 1/9/96 (pending); Ford Library, 11/8/95.